

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

Vol. II.—No. 16.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1861.

WHOLE NUMBER 68.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 370 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Baynes' Building) New-York.

WILLIAM GORRELL, Editor

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a Year, in Advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

PROSPECTUS.

As object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound moral
Christian reforms: the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the sumptuary, and
undared crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, the
law, business arrangements, and aims of life—to the individual, the family,
the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to
God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the
type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible. Our standard, the Divine law,
our authority, obedience to our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promise
our power, the whole armor of God.

✂ Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

THE BIBLE ABOLITIONIST.

(Containing the testimony of the Scripture against Slavery, and the Scriptural method of breaking it.)

"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this
word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. viii 20. "All Scripture
gives by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for correction, for
instruction in righteousness. That the man of God might be perfect, they
quickly furnished unto all good works." i Tim. iii 16-17.

Part III.—Slaveholding brought directly to the test of the human
Bible.

CHAPTER V.

SLAVEHOLDING CONDEMNED BY THE DECALOGUE. THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT.

"Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may
be long in the land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

What provision or permission does slavery provide for
the children of slaves to honor their father and mother?
To them, the command of the master, the mistress, the over-
seer, the driver, is everything—the command of the father
and mother is nothing. The child may be required to in-
flict ignominious stripes upon the father and the mother,
and he dares not disobey.

He cannot disobey without disobedience to the slave mas-
ter, a repudiation of his authority, and rebellion against
the slave system. Thus are the commandments of God
made of none effect, by the usages and customs of the
slaveholders, and thus must the statutes and usages of the
slaveholders be trampled under foot, in order to avoid
disobedience to God.

This commandment recognizes the family relation, and its
sacred obligations and rights, which all slaveholders disre-
gard and ignore in their slaves. No slaveholder holding
slave parents and children, can recognize their mutual obli-
gations and corresponding rights, without emancipating
them. What other form of making void the Fifth Com-
mandment can compare with the system and usages of
slaveholding?

SIXTH COMMANDMENT

6. Thine shalt not kill

Slavery is a murderous system from beginning to end,
it provides no adequate security for the life of the slave.
He is wholly in the power of a master, to whom he be-
longs. The slave may, with perfect impunity, be murdered
in the presence of hundreds of slaves or free people of color,
in the absence of any white witness. And few white persons
in slave States, dare testify to the murder of a slave by his
master. The Slave holds assurance that a slave man, some-
times his death by moderate correction. Crimes are fre-
quently perpetrated, not except possibly, in one or two in-
stances, the murderers have never been executed. And
agricultural societies seldom decide whether it is more profit-
able to use up a gang of field hands now in seven years
and purchase new, so that they may make time last

longer. In some regions, the general calculation favors the
former. Fugitive slaves, securing themselves, and taking
food from plantations, may be declared outlaws, and are
hunted and shot down like wild beasts.

Slaveholders do not, at all times, personally commit mur-
der. But they all help sustain the system that inevitably
commits murder, and prevents the punishment of the mur-
derers. And they all claim an authority over their slaves
that the government cannot sanction and enforce, and at
the same time provide protection to the lives of slaves. The
testimony of Judge Rufin, already cited in a previous chap-
ter, is conclusive on this point. The slave system, accord-
ing to Judge Rufin, cannot be maintained, nor the practice
of slaveholding continued, if any real legal protection is af-
forded to the slave. In other words, the legal protection
of the lives of slaves would be, practically, equivalent to
the abolition of slavery, and the prohibition of slaveholding.
If any confirmation of this view be needed, it is to be found
in the fact that no slaveholding community or government
has yet been found willing to attempt the experiment of af-
fording adequate legal protection to slaves, and at the same
time permitting the practice of slaveholding. The two are
notoriously incompatible with each other. The character of
slavery and of slaveholding are thus identified with each
other, and are both found incompatible with the authority
of the sixth commandment, which requires the protection of
human life. The insecurity of life, in slave States, arising
from the habits engendered by slaveholding, the consequent
familiarity of the people with bloodshed, and with the im-
punity of murderers, are facts too well known and too gen-
erally admitted, to need formal proof. What other system
of society can compare with the slave system, in its contempt
of the Sixth Commandment?

SEVENTH COMMANDMENT.

7. Thou shalt not commit adultery."

This commandment guards the institution of marriage,
attests its divine origin, teaches its inviolable sanctity, and
insists on the perpetuity of its obligations. It establishes
the family relation as an ordinance of God, and lays a founda-
tion for the inhibition of our Saviour,—"What, therefore,
God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (Mat.
xix, 6.) In each of these particulars, the seventh command-
ment is completely set aside and ignored by the slave sys-
tem, and the practice of slaveholding, even by professed
Christians, as has already been shown. It begins with a
denial to the slave, of the right or power to contract mar-
riage—to enter into the sacred relation, to establish a fam-
ily, to assume the responsibilities, or to discharge the duties
of the conjugal state. It next makes void the parental re-
lation, and the mutual duties and rights of parents and
children. It authorizes the slave master to sever parents
and children, and those who attempt to live together, as
husbands and wives. And finally, it places every slave,
wife, mother, daughter, and sister, in the slave States, com-
pletely under the control of the slave master, without any
protection by law, forbidding, on pain of instant death, any
defiance or resistance from any slave, thus precluding in-
iquity and protection to the victims of unbridled lust.

A more complete abrogation of the seventh commandment,
it is not possible for the ingenuity of man to invent, or for
the imagination of man to conceive. Yet all this is en-
forced by the civil courts. All this has received ecclesiasti-
cal sanction, as has already been shown. And all this is
sanctioned and sustained by the practice of slaveholding,
under a Code of which this feature forms an essential part,
so essential that its removal would overthrow the system,
release every slave and put it beyond the power of any
man to be or to remain a slaveholder. Let any slaveholder
appear to be or to remain a slaveholder, and the feature of the system.

and he is a slaveholder no longer, for he can do it in no
way but by emancipating his slaves. Yet we hear of "in-
nocent slaveholding," from the lips of men who profess
to honor God's ten commandments, including the seventh.

SIXTH LETTER TO SENATOR SEWARD.

TO HON. WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Sir: Your speech in the Senate has made some other
"recollections," which I must briefly notice, before closing the
train of remark suggested by that speech.

It has revealed the fully and the final result of that
series of compromises with slavery which gave shape to
the Republican party, and which is now in process of dis-
solving that party, unless it shall hasten to repudiate all com-
promises, and plant itself upon principles as enduring as the
Divine throne.

The Missouri "Compromise" was itself a stupendous folly,
the result of which was as clearly seen in 1820 when it was
formed, as it is in 1861 when the consummation is witnessed
—and as predicted accordingly. By consenting to that
compromise, the North gave up the South to the Demon of
Slavery, on condition that the North, above 36° 30' should
remain free, not perceiving that, in that act, a foundation
was laid for that very division of the Republic upon that same
line which is now, apparently taking place. Up to that time
the national creed and expectation had been, that all the
country was to become free. From that time forward, "the
understanding" came to be, that "the South" was given up
to the control of despotism, as, accordingly, it has been.

"Christians could compromise with crime.

The King King Saul and Judas traitor.

'Could balance dollar, cent, and dime.

'Against the changeless laws of God.

'With pencil, scale, and chart in hand,

'Lo! Freedom's soul, intent on self,

'Coolly divide their native land,

'Between the Demon and herself."

And now, when the Demon comes, in the shape of seces-
sion, to carry of the prize he bargained for, in 1820, (and af-
ter a struggle to carry off Kansas along with it) it is grate-
fully proposed to renew the compromise, to take another lease
of Northern liberty by signing another bond for Southern
Slavery, and travel the same dreary cycle over again. And,
as though this were not sufficient, you, Sir, as one of the
"champions of freedom" propose—not indeed a "compromise"
—but more than that—a concession, that is to give up the
North, too, along with the South by a bond, changeless as
the laws of the Medes and Persians.

The game of "Compromise" is played out, and ends in the
proposal of unconditional submission. Liberty's Republican-
ism, and every other political name and thing, are to be re-
linquished into the hands of the Demon, for the privilege of
indissoluble Union with him. The irrepressible con-
flict is to be repressed, and "the higher law" subjugated by
lawlessness. Be this the epitaph of a successful "compromise."

III. Your speech has, accordingly, revealed the unpopu-
larity of committing the interests of freedom to the hands of
politicians who can consent to make compromises with sla-
very. The half-dozen Northern dough-faces—as John Ran-
dolph dubbed them—who after a severe struggle, gave way,
and voted in Congress for the Missouri Compromise, were
indignantly driven, by their immediate constituents, into a
refractory to private life, from which they never again emerg-
ed. An era of "compromise" nevertheless, succeeded, in
which compromisers have held full sway and have brought
upon us our present troubles. From henceforth, the friends
of freedom will know better than to trust them.

• Song of the Missouri Compromise—Provision B. (January,
May 1820.)

And they will have learned what a compromise with slavery is—and that it includes every arrangement by which it is attempted to preserve the liberties of one portion of the people, and of one section of the country, while leaving another portion of the people, or another section of the country to the tender mercies of a ruthless despotism. This was the definition, the condemnation, and the fatal virus of the infamous Missouri Compromise, as it has been of all those that have succeeded it.

IV. Another important revelation of your speech—if it be another—is this, that there can be no such thing as protection for freedom in one State of the Union, while freedom is left unprotected in another State of the Union—that there can be no successful assertion of "State Rights" for the protection of State citizens, by politicians who have not learned the right and duty of the Federal Government to protect Federal citizens. By this class of politicians, it has been pleaded that they cannot, as Federal legislators, protect personal liberty, in the several States, lest it should interfere with "State Rights." But what, Sir, becomes of State Rights if there are to be no State laws for protecting the citizens of the State? Until within a few months, the Republican party has been confidently relied upon to repeal all Fugitive Slave Bills of the Federal Government and to enact efficient Personal Liberty Bills in all the Free States. But they now find the leaders of that party among the most forward to urge the repeal, even of the feeble and inadequate Personal Liberty bills that already exist. And the speech of WILLIAM H. SEWARD, one of their chief champions, assures them that they are to have no protection from him. This, Sir, let me assure you, is a revelation that kindles with indignation or reddens with blushes, the countenances of scores of thousands who have voted for the Republican party, and for yourself. The medicine administered in that speech was most unpalatable—it will be efficacious and salutary, nevertheless.

V. Another revelation of your speech, accordingly, is this—that there is no remedy for our existing difficulties, no restoration of peace and harmony, no putting an end to existing agitations and alienations, no preservation of the Union, no enjoyment of the blessings of good Government, no material prosperity (so far as that is dependent upon security, peace, liberty, and good government) without a national abolition of Slavery, the sole cause of all the difficulties and evils that afflict the nation.

I call this a revelation of your speech—not because it was not previously manifest to all reflecting minds that had been devoted to the study of the subject, but because your speech, from the elevated position you occupy, from the high expectations that had been cherished respecting you, and the confidence reposed in your wisdom, has forced upon large masses of your fellow citizens, the contemplation of an alternative, not alluded to in your speech, but irresistibly suggested by its perusal.

The Republican party, say, all men of all parties, especially at the North, were instinctively waiting and watching to see what William H. Seward would propose—taking for granted that it would be something that, without an utter surrender of liberty, "Republicanism and every political name and thing," would nevertheless restore harmony and preserve or re-establish Union.

But, Sir, when they heard your distinct announcement, at the outset, that "Republicanism" and every other political name and thing "must needs be given up, for the sake of Union, their eyes, for the first time, began to open upon the great problem of the crisis. And when, with breathless attention, they pursued the perusal of your speech to the close, and found that, in detail, you carried out the general statement with which you began—when they saw you surrendering, or proposing to surrender, to the Slave Power, the very citadel and every outpost of civil, religious, political and personal freedom, and then hotting the door by an *untenable* Constitution, against all future possibility, (otherwise than by a bloody revolution,) of a resumption, by the people, or their posterity of the liberties their fathers had declared to be inalienable—then, Mr. Seward, they began to inquire, in earnest, whether any thing could be done, and if so *what*, to preserve Freedom.

For, strange as it may appear to you, Mr. Seward, the great masses of our Northern citizens, of all parties, even after a perusal of your able speech, find no small difficulty in admitting the *realist* that "Republican and every

political name and thing" should be given up to maintain Union. Yet at the same time, there could not fail to arise the question whether Union and Freedom could not be preserved. The first impression, I think, very extensively made, was that the Union must be given up, rather than Freedom. That the latter could remain, after making the concessions proposed by you, was not for a moment to be imagined. The idea of a peaceful separation of the States began, therefore, to be broached. Throughout the Republican and Democratic ranks, it found more or less favor. This, Mr. Seward, was one of the earliest and most marked effects of your speech, effects the very opposite of your intentions.

Not long, however, was that idea thus favorably entertained. The inquiry irresistibly arose—*why* must either Freedom or Unity be relinquished? Is there anything in the one that is incongruous with the other? Certainly not. *What* is it that demands the surrender of Freedom, as a condition of Union? What is it *what* can it be, but Slavery? It can be nothing else. Why then should not Slavery give way, instead of either Union or Freedom?

If national necessities, as we are told, required the relinquishment of either of the three—which can the nation best spare? Then, again, would a separation of the States restore peace and harmony, in the presence of Freedom and Slavery? What could represent the "irrepressible conflict" between them, as heretofore?

Thus, Mr. Seward, is your speech compelling your constituents, your fellow-citizens, to reason. And unless you can speedily furnish them with some good reason why it is more injurious for the nation to give up slavery than either Freedom or Union, I should not greatly wonder if they should come to the conclusion, that of the three "institutions," Freedom is the most necessary to be retained, that Union comes next in the order of value, and in the absence of Slavery, would naturally harmonize with Freedom, while the "peculiar institution of domestic Slavery" (not absolutely necessary to the culture of Cotton) is, of the three, the very "institution" that—with all its claims to patriarchal antiquity and Biblical sanction, by the side of the golden rule—*could best be spared by the Nation, at this peculiar and sensitive crisis.*

I say, "necessaries"—for your entire Speech is founded on the idea of the necessity of making concessions to slavery. If the law of necessity is to be invoked, as you Sir, have invoked it, if Constitutions must give way to it, and he so amended as to reverse their declared objects, then, Sir, the people, I trust, will insist, that this same law of national necessity be thoroughly studied and impartially applied to the exigencies of the case. And if national necessities are urged as reasons for relinquishing Freedom, by radical changes of the Constitution, against Freedom, then, Sir, how much more forcibly and equitably may it be pleaded that the Constitution, as it is, according to its strict letter and spirit, as an acknowledged anti-slavery constitution, shall be honestly administered against Slavery, the eradication of which is alone necessary to restore peace and unity?

I may be asked, perhaps, how "the South" is to be brought to acquiesce in such an application of the law of necessity as I have here indicated. I answer by asking how the North is to be brought to acquiesce in the application of the same law, indicated in your Speech? By "the South" is commonly meant the two or three hundred thousand slaveholders of the South, ignoring the six or eight millions of non-slaveholding whites, and the four millions of slaves.

In a resort to the doctrine of necessities, which will be found easiest, to bring thirty millions of freemen to relinquish their liberties (for nothing less than this, Mr. Seward, do you counsel them) or to bring two or three hundred thousand slaveholders to relinquish their sway over four millions of slaves and thirty millions of freemen?

But I deny that the two or three hundred thousand slaveholders are "the South." I deny that a single State has seceded from the Union. "The South" are the millions of the South.—The States are the people residing in the States. "The South," and "the Southern States" are for Freedom and Union, and for the utter overthrow of the slave system. Nothing is wanting but that the people of the Non-Slaveholding States should open their eyes to this fact, and be equally with the South, in favor of Free-

dom, with Union—justly opposed to slavery for the element of disunion.

The Republican President, elect, and his Cabinet, (of which you, Sir, are expected to become) will be instrumental to "respect the rights of the South." Could I have access to the ear of Mr. Lincoln and his Cabinet, I would, through Northern men, most respectfully, most earnestly, and most plainly, reiterate the petition in the streets, the exhortation—*Respect the rights of the South.* Yes! Of the white South, of every man, woman and child, in the South the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, the security of which, the nation declared itself independent, appealing to "the Supreme Judge of the world" the rectitude of their intentions "to establish a Government for that end. Lend your influence in the Cabinet to that end, Mr. Seward, in obedience to the declared object of the Constitution in its Preamble, and you will again be recognized as a champion of freedom, and become instrumental, in securing the harmony, union, and prosperity, which were the ends of your Speech, but which, be assured—and in no way to be attained but by a rejection of your proposed concessions.

YOUR OBL. SERVANT,
WILLIAM GODDARD
339 Pearl Street, New York, March, 2, 1861.

For the People.
NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY
No. 29.

In a late speech, in the Senate of the United States, Mr. Wade said, "it would be one of the most blessed things, if inducements could be made to every black man among us to find a home in Central America or lower Mexico. They adopt the homestead policy, and we will have such a powerful vestment in native white men, as was never before seen." Why did not Mr. Wade express a wish for which he could offer a sensible reason? He might have wished slaveholders out of the Union. But any human thing that is white, however turbulent, despotic, degraded, or vicious, is more tolerable to some men, than respectable black people are. He proceeds to indulge in magnificent speculations about the influx of strangers from every clime and the accession of Canada, and says, "we will have all the elements to build up a republic, more powerful and more just than the world ever dreamed of."

What a sentiment for a statesman! Remove all our native citizens who are not white, receive foreigners of every nation, no matter of what character, be they only white, and we shall have a powerful republic, "just" even by your dreams! As if justice was sensitive about complexions and could prevail only where men are all of one color! Or as if we might remove the spirit of injustice by removing its dark colored victims! Has Senator Wade yet to learn what justice means? He ought to know that whenever justice reigns in his own heart, he will respect the white man's rights, and the black man's rights alike, and be solicitous that both should enjoy their due, without the inconsistency and regrets of expatriation. He will not wish to injure man away, but wage war with the cruel spirit that injure him. What would be the use of removing the black man from the country? The injustice that demands his removal, would, in his absence, find other victims equally unfortunate. The spirit that seeks the removal of the black man is a spirit of injustice. Men do not learn to be just by the practice of injustice, but the contrary. The infliction of one wrong burdens the heart for the infliction of another. Should we, without relenting, witness an exodus of colored people constrained by our wishing to be rid of them, we should be more insensible to right than before. We would that insensibility be barren of bitter fruits to the maining population? Certainly not. Our only way is to be just for the sake of justice, and not for the sake of a more particular color.

Black people have better reasons for wishing to be free than white people. Listen to a few of their complaints at the mouth of one of them. The late Rev. T. S. Wright, a colored clergyman, thus describes the wrongs suffered by black people from prejudice.

"No man can really understand this prejudice unless he feels it crushing him from below, because it is a matter of feeling. It is built, as rows, and bars, wherever the colored man goes. It has bolts in all the doors and hinges. The spirit of

LETTER FROM INDIANA.

BRO. WILLIAM GODDELL.—Seeing that we are compassed about with such a multitude of opponents, it becomes necessary that we should put on the whole armour of God, and be shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace, that we may be able to stand the fiery darts of the wicked one, and come off more than conqueror through Him that loved us, and gave himself for us. With these weapons of warfare, we may be able to subdue whole nations, for they are not carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of the strongholds of Satan. For Satan is, in these latter days, displaying his great power among the sons and daughters of men, East and West, North and South, and roaring through the Southern secessionist States, and deceiving those slaveholders who are become willingly ignorant, because of advantage over the poor African race, on account of their color, which God has given them.

Now, I ask every slaveholder in the United States, whether or not they can prove that the white man is made in the image of God, and the African is not; and further, I ask them to prove by Divine Will, that they are not God's creation. And my special request is for them to prove their rights to hold them in bondage by the authority of heaven, or by the organic law of our nation. I do positively assert that this cannot be done, neither by the Bible nor the Constitution of the United States. Both Democrats and Republicans have charged the abolitionists with being the cause of the kicking out of the Union. Such I am constrained to believe is not the case. For I believe that the system that is advocated by the abolitionists, is the only system that a just government can be established upon. New laws may be enacted, compromise lines may be drawn, the Constitution may be amended, and after all this is done, we can never have a government of peace, unless slavery is abolished in our nation. For it is a national sin, and God will overturn this nation, and bring upon her the sword, famine, and pestilences in divers places, if the inhabitants, both North and South, do not repent of their wickedness, with reference to the system of slavery. For this system has found advocates, North and South, East and West, and the true principles of our government, men are willing to trample under foot, for the sake of keeping the poor African race in bondage, on account of their color. Where is the hope for you, slaveholders, of eternal life, you who have bought and sold human flesh, and have deprived thousands of souls of the privilege of entering into the kingdom of heaven? Ye will not enter in yourselves, and them that would enter in, ye have hindered. The Northern Republicans and Democrats, say they do not want slavery in the free States, for they believe it is not right, and a great many of them are willing to acknowledge that the system is wicked in the sight of God, but still, they are willing that the South shall keep their system of slavery, and be sent down to perdition, with all the nations that forget God, and they are ready to say, amen, to the Southern condemnation, when the Lord comes to collect his jewels. This indirectly consenting to the system of slavery, will not meet the demands of the law of God. The Judge will say, "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto the least of your Southern brethren, ye did it not unto me."

I have taken decided grounds against the system of slavery, and I never will cast a vote for any man that is in favor of slavery, either directly or indirectly, unless it is for some local office; but I do hope that I shall enjoy the privilege of voting at the next Presidential election for a man of liberty, in the State of Indiana, for there must be some electoral votes in my native State, for the abolitionist candidate for next term.

WILLIAM R. ADAMS Shelby County, Indiana.

Congress.—Mr. Sumner (Rep. Mass.) presented petition from citizens of Massachusetts and Philadelphia against compromise. He also presented a petition from citizens of Massachusetts asking Congress to enact a law that no person shall be held in servitude by the laws of any State, and that such persons now held be declared free. He said he presented the petition because he thought it his duty to do so, having been presented to him in a proper and respectful form; but he would take this occasion to declare, most explicitly, that he did not believe that Congress had any right to interfere with Slavery in the States.—*Tribune*.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 21, 1863

THE PARAMOUNT AUTHORITY OF THE SLAVEHOLDER.

There are various grades of authority. And, of necessity, there must be one authority paramount to all others, in the presence of which, all other authority gives way.

In America, the highest, the paramount authority is that of the slaveholder.

The people in America, are called the sovereigns, the source, under God, of all political authority. But their authority vanishes in the presence of the slaveholder. About three hundred thousand slaveholders, more or less, with no official prerogatives, as such, hold thirty millions of Americans in abject subjection! The proportion of the slaveholders to the people of the United States is as one to three hundred. Nevertheless, one slaveholder among three hundred, is found sufficient for the maintenance of their paramount authority.

Numbers, in America, are regarded as a foundation of authority. But the all-controlling authority, that of the slaveholders, is the authority of an insignificant minority—less numerous than the abolitionists, who, in the decision of any political question, are not considered worth counting.

The possession of wealth confers authority. But wealth does not give to the slaveholder his authority. The slaveholders are poor, in comparison with the non-slaveholders controlled by them. The authority of the slaveholders, however poor, and few, outweighs the authority of non-slaveholders, however wealthy and numerous.

Majorities in Republics, have authority. But the authority of slaveholders is paramount to that of majorities. The majority may elect Presidents, but must first propitiate the almost inappreciable minority of slaveholders, before they can inaugurate them. If Abraham Lincoln should be inaugurated next Monday, it will be because Seward and his associates, or a portion of them, have been down upon their knees with their proffered concessions, and have appeased the wrath of a majority of the Maryland and Virginia slaveholders.

It would have been ridiculous for any minority of three hundred thousand, other than slaveholders, to have disputed his inauguration, and equally ridiculous for the majority to have deliberated upon "measures of pacification." More than three hundred thousand abolitionists, it may be presumed, are dissatisfied with the election of Lincoln. More than a million Republicans, Free-soilers and Abolitionists, were dissatisfied with the election of Buchanan.

But no "measures of pacification" were offered to the Republicans, Free Soilers, and Abolitionists, in 1856. And none are offered to the Abolitionists—no—not to the Douglas Democrats of the North, in 1860. But why not? Simply because they were not slaveholders! If they had been, the call for conciliation, by compromise or concession, would have been overwhelming. Mr. Jefferson was twice elected, against the almost unanimous vote of New-England. But nobody thought of asking leave of New-England, or of making concessions to her, to secure the inauguration of Mr. Jefferson, for the New-Englanders were not slaveholders!

Constitutions are regarded, as having authority. But not against the demands of slaveholders, who either hold the monopoly of expounding Constitutions, or, when this fails, of demanding the amendment of them, and the reversal of their provisions.

Courts of law, judicial decisions, acts of legislation are supposed to have authority. But the authority of the slaveholder is held paramount to all these, either controlling and wielding them, or else superseding them by Lynch law at the South, and by mob law at the North. Mayors, Aldermen, Common Councilmen, are said to have authority, but not in the presence of slaveholders, except to execute their wishes. College Presidents, Professors and Tutors have a show of authority. But the authority of half a dozen or a dozen young students, sons of slaveholders, is paramount to all their authority, and College laws have to be modelled to their liking, or the operation of them, upon the young heirs apparent of slaveholders, is suspended, or rendered obsolete.

Ecclesiastical bodies Bishops, Conferences, General Assemblies, Synods, Presbyteries, and Church Sessions, make claims to authority. But not as against or over slaveholders who hold paramount authority over them. There is no Church authority to discipline slaveholders. Let the history of the Episcopal, the Presbyterian, the Methodist, and the Baptist churches in America, bear testimony on this subject. Let the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church could "hold in deepest abhorrence the practice of slavery but could not discipline slaveholders. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church could condemn slaveholding as "men stealing," the highest kind of theft; but it could not administer Church discipline upon the men-thieves, ecclesiastical authority can discipline abolitionists, and every body else, except slaveholders.

The Federal Government has authority to execute the laws of the Union, except in the case of slaveholders. It can execute the provisions of the Fugitive Slave Bill, but cannot collect the revenue from rebellious slaveholders. The cry of "coercion and civil war" is raised, instantly, at any attempt to enforce the petty oligarchy of slaveholders under the control of Federal law. The embargo and non-intercourse laws could be enforced upon the merchants of the North, for they were not slaveholders. The proposal to collect the revenue of slaveholders, the same as of non-slaveholders, is denounced, as a just cause of secession, by the slaveholding states who have not yet seceded.

The suspicion of a design, on the part of the Hartford Convention, to promote a secession of the New-England States, was denounced as treason. The charge of it demolished the Federal party, and the odium rests upon New-England, still. The secession of slave states is claimed as a right. The difference is just this. The Hartford Convention was composed of non-slaveholders. The Southern Conventions were composed of slaveholders, who claim rights that non-slaveholders may not claim.

In all this is seen the paramount, the unlimited authority of slaveholders.

The authority of the Creator and Governor of the Universe, is held to be paramount to all other authority, except in the case of slaveholders, who claim the right of annulling all Divine laws, in the provisions and adjudications of the Slave code, annulling marriage, putting asunder whom God hath joined together, legalizing adultery, forbidding education, withholding the bible, and enforcing labor without wages, directly in the face of all the dictates of conscience and of every requirement and prohibition of natural and revealed religion.

And this paramount authority of the slaveholder over his Maker is approvingly recognized and submitted to, by every Church and ecclesiastical body that receives and retains slaveholders in its communion without any reproval of their slaveholding. Especially is this true of those ecclesiastical bodies whose present or former testimonies against slavery, while retaining slaveholders in their connection, attest the fact that they know what they are doing, by their fellowship with slaveholders, and that they are obeying slaveholders rather than God.

The nation, at this moment, is in a state of disorganization, growing out of the fact that slaveholders are in a state of rebellion, because, for the first time, the nation has disputed the unlimited authority of slaveholders, over the elections. When the seceders deny that they are the rebels, the denial is equivalent to a charge against the nation of having rebelled against their paramount authority. Every demand of concession is a demand for a return of implicit obedience to the paramount authority of the slaveholders. And every Northern proposal of concession is a proposal to comply with that demand.

God says, "Thou shalt not deliver to his master the servant that hath escaped from his master unto thee. The slaveholder says—Thou shalt deliver him. The nation obeys God, that it may obey the slaveholder.

God says, "Plead the cause of the poor and needy—Ory loud. Spare not. Lift up thy voice like a trumpet against oppression. The slaveholder says—Hush. Thou shalt not agitate the subject. The churches, and the country—a majority of them—disobey God's command, in obedience to the authority of the slaveholder.

God says, "Execute justice between a man and his neighbor." "Deliver him that is spoiled, out of the hands of oppressor." "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land."

House of Representatives—The House first rejected the proposal to call a National Convention to revise and amend the Constitution of the United States, by the decisive vote of 74 to 109. They next rejected Mr. Kellogg's proposition, 38 to 135,—thus that Mr. J. Menzies, 80 to 115, was then adopted, by the decisive vote of 55 to 58, the resolutions reported by Mr. Corwin's Committee of Thirty-three.

These resolutions declare, substantially—

1. That all proper and constitutional remedies for existing wrongs, and all guarantees for existing rights, necessary to preserve the Union, should be promptly and cheerfully granted—

2. That all attempts to obstruct the recovery of fugitive slaves are inconsistent with interstate comity, and dangerous to the peace of the Union—

3. That the several States be requested to revise their statutes and repeal such as may be in conflict with Federal laws on this subject—

4. That Slavery is recognized as existing by usage in fifteen States, and there is no authority outside those States to interfere with it.

5. That claims on the subject of fugitives from labor should be faithfully executed, and that citizens of each State should be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

6. That there is no cause for a dissolution of this Government and that it is the duty of Congress to preserve its existence on terms of equality and justice to all the States.

7. That the faithful observance of the Constitution, on the part of the States, is essential to the peace of the country.

8. That each State is requested to revise its statutes, and amend them, if necessary, so as to protect citizens of other States who may be travelling therein, against violence.

9. That each State be requested to enact laws to punish violators of other States from its soil.

10. That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Governors and Legislatures of the several States.

11. That as no proposition has been made to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia or Government dock yards, or interfere with the inter-State Slave trade, no action on these subjects is needed.

The proposition to amend the Constitution, so as to prohibit amendments interfering with slavery, received 120 votes to 71,—but as there were not two-thirds in its favor, it was not passed.

The Select Committee of Five, on the President's Message concerning the proposals of the Gulf States, has submitted a report recommending the adoption of the following Resolution.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this House, the President had no constitutional power to negotiate with the representatives of the State of South Carolina for the surrender of all public property within the limits of that State, and that it is inexpedient for Congress to take any further action in relation thereto.—*Tribune*.

The stolen Indian bonds.—On application by the holders of the Indian bonds stolen by Mr. Floyd, Mr. Caleb Cushing, as professionally, as a lawyer, investigated their claims and has furnished an elaborate argument in favor of their validity. He cites a rule of the Supreme Court as follows: When the United States, by their authorized officer, become a party to negotiable paper, they have all the rights, and are bound by the liabilities, of individuals who are parties to such instruments.

Or, in the language of Justice Baldwin—
If he, (the head of department) accepted the draft of a contractor, absolutely, the United States are bound to pay it to the holder, to the same extent and on the same principles, which apply to a bill of exchange drawn and accepted by a private person.

He concludes thus.

I say then
First.—That the liability of the United States, for these acceptances is fixed by authoritative decisions of the Supreme Court, confirmed by acts of Congress.

Secondly.—That those decisions are reasonable and just, and that they have to be rendered now if it were a question of new imposition.

And, finally, that your clients have done everything in the premises which law and justice could require to discharge them from any inquiry, or to be impaired in the full and equal and equitable right to demand payment of these acceptances at the hands of the United States. I have the honor to be, very respectfully,
C. CUSHING.

HON. ALFRED RIMON.

This seems reasonable. The moral is, no king or emperor is so ignorant as to employ men without giving him a business for that, he must be held responsible for their doings.—*Ed. Nor.*

The House bill, authorizing the suspension of the postal service in the seceding States, yesterday passed the Senate by a vote of 34 to 12, and now goes to the President for his signature.

Southern Confederacy. The Tariff Act—Be it enacted, That all flowing articles shall be exempt from duty, and admitted free into the several States, to wit: Bacon, pork, lard, and beef, fish of all kinds, wheat and flour of all

other grains, Indian corn and meal, barley, flour, rice and rice flour, oats and oatmeal, gunpowder, and all the materials of which it is made, lead in all forms, arms of every description and munitions of war and military accoutrements, percussion caps, and living animals of all kinds: also, all agricultural products in their natural state.

Sec. 2. Enacts that all goods, wares, and merchandise imported from any one of the United States of America, not being a member of this Confederacy, before the 4th of March next, which may have been bona fide purchased heretofore, or within ten days after the passage of this act, shall be exempt from duty.

Sec. 3. Enacts that the State of Texas be, and is hereby, exempted from the operation of the tariff laws heretofore passed or adopted by Congress.

HOWARD C. PARK, President of the Congress.

J. J. HLOOPER, Secretary.

Passed February 18, 1861.

Family Miscellany.

From the Indiana Republican.

THE OLD LOG HOUSE.

BY ELIZABETH WAT.

It stands there lone and silent

Its chimney smoking low;

Its roof all densely coated

With the white pelts of snow.

The window panes are broken,

The doors are all unshut;

A heap of rubbish covers

The hearth where the fire once smelt.

The sunlight peeps through the crack of doors,

And through the chink in the wall;

While through the dusty panes

Spiders and reptiles crawl.

Not yet, it stands in the meadow,

That deer, loved, halloved spot;

It was the home of my childhood,

And never can be forgot.

The same old trees surround it,

The beech, the elm, the pine;

While through the old, old branches

Yet creep the old grape vine.

The robin his carol sings in

The maple by the spring;

And in the dear old orchard,

The Lincoln's gaily sing.

And there beneath that willow

Whose branches touch the ground

An infant sister, sleeping

Lies 'neath that little mound.

All bring fresh to memory

And with them olden days

The days when oft I sported

Among those scenes so dear.

I drop a tear on the threshold

Of my old father's door;

As I go away forever

From the merry-hunted spot.

For the Principia.

STORY FOR THE LITTLE FOLKS.

CHAPTER X. Continued.

Then was the king full of fury, and the form of his visage was changed against Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, and he commanded that they should heat the furnace one seven times more than it was wont to be heated. Then he commanded the most mighty men, that were in his army, to bid these young men, and cast them into the burning fiery furnace. And they bound them, with their garments all on, and cast them in. But the furnace was so exceeding hot, that the flame of fire slew those men that put them in. And these three young men fell down bound into the midst of the burning fiery furnace. Then was the king astonished and rose up in haste, and said to his counsellors, "Did not we cast three men bound into the midst of the fire?" They answered and said unto him, True, oh king. Then said he, "I saw them alive, and walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt, and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." Then the king came near to the mouth of the burning fiery furnace, and spake and said, "Shadrach Meshach and Abed-nego, ye servants of the most high God, come forth, and come hither," and they came forth out of the fire.

And the princes, governors, and captains, and the king's counsellors, being gathered together, saw these men upon whose bodies the fire had no power, nor was an hair of their heads singed, neither were their coats changed, nor the smell of fire had passed on them.

Then the king spake and said, "Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, who have sent his angel, and delivered his servants that trusted in him, and have changed the king's word, and added their bodies that they might not serve nor worship any God, except the true God. Then the king made a decree, by every

people, within and without, which should speak anything against the God in Heaven, whom these young men serve, should be put in pieces, and their houses destroyed, because there is no other God that can do after this manner. And the king promoted these young men to high positions in the province of Babylon.

Now, dear children, you can see by this what a safe, noble, sublime and glorious thing it is to do right, and to do God, and trust the result in his hands, even if we have a stand alone in doing it.

Death, in a most horrid form, stared these young men in the face, if they obeyed God, but they did it, and he delivered them. And the king and counsellors, and people, that trust Empire, were taught a lesson, that day of undying importance to their souls. They saw that it was useless to trust in idols, and that there was no God like the God of heaven. They saw that it was safe to obey him, always. And the king's golden image was cast into the shade. The king also learned that those who would be faithful to God, would be safe men to trust, anywhere.

And it would be of vast importance to our own country, if this truth had a proper influence on the minds of the people, when they select rulers, legislators and other public officers. But if those young men had bowed down to the image, all these good results would have been lost.

MARY. Were not those young men the best subject that the king had, although they disobeyed his wicked commands?

Yes, among the best. We are informed, however, that there was another young man, among the king's subjects, like them; but he does not appear to have been present, on this occasion.

WILLIE. Are not true Christians, in all countries, the most likely to be faithful in all the relations of life.

I think so, but there are some, who bear the name, who are ready to bow down to the golden image.

In our own land, slavery is the great image that is set up, and the people are required to acknowledge that it has a right to exist, and that it should be protected by law. But as it is contrary to God's will, it ought to be destroyed.

Now our part of the people are in favor of Freedom, and the other part are on the side of slavery. But the Government being on the side of despotism, we are called upon to bow down to this Moloch of slavery. The signal has been given, many have bent the knee, and many more are prostrate in the dust before the image. But there is a band of faithful ones, who will not bow down to, nor worship this image of all villainies. Consequently there is strife in the land, whether the Lord shall be God, or slavery.

CHARLIE. Have persons in our country any better right to compromise with slavery, than those young men who bowed down to the golden image?

I think not. To compromise principle, is to sacrifice principle to wicked expediency, and shows the compromiser to be faithless and false to his convictions of justice and right. And his fidelity is no more to be confided in than the honesty of the thief or robber is.

WILLIE. Would it be wicked for the members of Congress, or the people, to make any more compromise with slavery, to quiet the agitation of the country?

I think it would, for if slavery be wrong, then we ought to seek its immediate overthrow. And those who counsel to further concession in its behalf, are really on the side of despotism and cruelty, of the deepest and darkest day. And God will be against those who countenance slavery. And our dear children, let us always obey God, and thereby do right, then we shall be safe. But the ways of the wicked shall be turned upside down.

Truthfully yours,

Maple Cottage, Feb. 18, 1861.

DEARER T.

A ROMANTIC NARRATIVE OF A FAMILY ELEVEN YEARS AMONG THE INDIANS.

The Cleveland Leader has the following. A man by the name of Kimball, accompanied by his wife, came in on a Toledo freight train on Saturday last, on their way Eastward. They arrived there from 1848 to 1859 they were held in captivity by a tribe of the Snake Indians, from whom they managed to effect their escape a year and half ago. They were married in San Francisco, where they left in company with a party of sixty-three, who were going to California. The wife's name was Mrs. Kimball.

